

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 6-20 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1-4 and 6-8 are rejected. Claim 5 is objected to. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 4 and 5 have been cancelled. New claims 18-20 have been added for substantive examination.

Reconsideration of the objections and rejections set forth in the aforementioned Office Action is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Zetterstrom et al. (WO 96/00661). Claims 1, 2, 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Arkus-Duntov et al. (US 3,147,815).

The Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 5 and intervening claim 4. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-3 and 6-8 are now allowable. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 102 rejections to these claims.

The Applicants provide new claims 18-20 for substantive examination. The Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18-20 are not anticipated by any of the references cited by the Examiner and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. In particular, none of the references cited by the Examiner disclose an integrated rear suspension assembly including a compound link member being moveable relative to the frame rails and having opposing ends attached to each of the second ends of the plurality of trailing arms, in combination with the other elements of claim 18. On the contrary, element 8 of Arkus-Duntov et al. is a cross frame member rigidly fixed to side rails 4 and 6. In addition, Zetterstrom fails to disclose a compound

link member having opposing ends attached to each of second ends of the plurality of trailing arms where the second ends of the trailing arms are defined as being secured to each of the rear wheel carriers. On the contrary, Zetterstrom discloses an anti-roll bar, and not a compound link member. Furthermore, the anti-roll bar 24 of Zetterstrom has ends coupled to bushing sleeves 22 at mounting points approximately midway between the ends of bars 18. At page 4, lines 27-31, Zetterstrom points out the importance of this mounting position by stating that the anti-roll bar is highly efficient due to the mid-point mounting. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that not only does Zetterstrom not disclose each and every element of claims 18-20, but explicitly teaches away from such an arrangement should the Examiner choose to combine Zetterstrom with another reference in a § 103 rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zetterstrom et al. in view of Toda (JP 6127231).

The Applicants respectfully rely on the amendments and arguments previously set forth regarding the § 102 rejections. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that none of the references cited by the Examiner, either solely or in combination with one another, render any of the presently pending claims as obvious. As such, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103 rejection.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 9-17 are allowed.

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating the allowable subject matter. Claim 1 has been rewritten to include the limitations of objected claim 5 and intervening claim 4.

CONCLUSION

All of the grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. The Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding office action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If it is believed that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1222. Prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 26, 2009

By: /Donald G. Walker/
Donald G. Walker – Reg. No. 44390
Attorneys for Applicants

Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.
P. O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
Phone: 248/641-1600
Facsimile: 248/641-0270

DGW/jmm